

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

RECEIVED

JUN 11 2002

SHERIDAN, ROSS

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITYTo:
DENNIS J. DUPRAY
SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 80202

Reviewed:

Date:

Initial:

Date of Mailing
(day/month/year)

REPLY DUE

within 2 months/days from
the above date of mailing

Applicant's or agent's file reference

Please return to Janico

4500-1-PCT

International application No.

International filing date (day/month/year)

Priority date (day/month/year)

PCT/US01/15394

11 May 2001 (11.05.2001)

11 May 2000 (11.05.2000)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(7): G09B 3/00, 7/00 and US Cl.: 434/322

Applicant

J. THOMAS REYNOLDS

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☒ Certain documents cited
- VII ☒ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.**When?** See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~**How?** By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.**Also** For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6**If no reply is filed**, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 11 September 2002 (11.09.2002)Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Box PCT
Washington, D.C. 20231

Facsimile No. (703)305-3230

Authorized officer

Valencia Martin-Wallace

Telephone No. 703-308-1148

Shelia Verney
Paralegal Specialist
Group 3700

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
DENNIS J. DUPRAY
SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 80202-5141

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 05 JUN 2002	
Applicant's or agent's file reference 4500-1-PCT	REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/US01/15394	International filing date (day/month/year) 11 May 2001 (11.05.2001)
Priority date (day/month/year) 11 May 2000 (11.05.2000)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): G09B 3/00, 7/00 and US Cl.: 434/322	
Applicant J. THOMAS REYNOLDS	

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II ☐ Priority
 - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI ☒ Certain documents cited
 - VII ☒ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 *bis*.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 11 September 2002 (11.09.2002)

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Box PCT
Washington, D.C. 20231
Facsimile No. (703)305-3230

Authorized officer
Valencia Martin-Wallace
Telephone No. 703-308-1148

Shelia Verney
Shelia Verney
Paralegal Specialist
Group 3700

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US01/15394

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application:*

- ☐ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 pages 1-112, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims:
 pages NONE, as originally filed
 pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages 113-115-6, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the drawings:
 pages 1-15, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 pages NONE, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages NONE _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. NONE _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE _____

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US01/15394

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>1-26</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>1-26</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-26</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-26 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(4), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the combination comprising requesting the user to identify at least one driving force relevant to at least one choice option C of the choice options, wherein said driving force is a response to identify a ranking in said goals corresponding to said choice option C, said ranking being according to a user perceived importance of the goals to the participant.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US01/15394

VI. Certain document cited

1. Certain published documents (Rule 70.10)

Application No Patent No.	Publication Date (day/month/year)	Filing Date (day/month/year)	Priority date (valid claim) (day/month/year)
US 6,296,487 B1	02 October 2001 (02.10.2001)	14 June 1999 (14.06.1999)	NONE
US 6,368,111 B2	09 April 2002 (09.04.2002)	23 June 1998 (23.06.1998)	24 June 1997 (24.06.1997)
US 6,341,267 B1	22 January 2002 (22.01.2002)	02 July 1997 (02.07.1997)	NONE
US 6,361,326 B1	26 March 2002 (26.03.2002)	19 February 1999 (19.02.1999)	20 February 1998 (20.02.1998)

2. Non-written disclosures (Rule 70.9)

Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-written disclosure (day/month/year)	Date of written disclosure referring to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
--------------------------------	--	---

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US01/15394

VII. Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

Claim 1 (line 15) is objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(iii) as containing the following defect(s) in the form or contents thereof:
There is an extraneous character (i.e. _) before the word "wherein".

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US01/15394

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.